

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/695,311	OOHIRA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	David A. Zarneke	2827	

**All Participants:**

(1) David A. Zarneke.

(2) Robert Mattson.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Yasuyuki Onishi.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 16 December 2003

**Time:** 10:00 AM

**Type of Interview:**

- ☐ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☒ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

*8 and 11*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Fjelstad & Steffen*


**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed independent claim 8 and the Steffen rejection. We came to agreement that insertion of a limitation into the claim specifying the device to be adapted to attach to a motherboard would distinguish around Steffen's teaching of a chip card. Regarding claim 11, the examiner believes that the amendment proposed in the interview would require further search and consideration..